

REMARKS

A final Office Action was mailed on March 26, 2004. Claims 1 – 13 are pending in the present application. Applicants amend claims 1, 2, 4, 8 and 13. No new matter is added. Support for the amendments may be found, for example, in Applicants' specification at page 19, line 34 through page 34, line 3.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1 - 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,941,996 to Smith et al. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

As disclosed in independent claims 1, 8 and 11, Applicants disclose a monitoring system for monitoring information indicative of the status of objects, comprising a local monitoring apparatus and a central monitoring apparatus. The local monitoring apparatus includes a memory for storing first and second information sets, a processing unit that changes the first set in response to an operation performed on the local monitoring apparatus and changes the second set in response to an operation performed on the central monitoring apparatus, an output for outputting the first information set to a local monitor, and a transmission unit for transmitting the second set to a second monitor of the central monitoring apparatus.

In this manner, the first information set and the second information set are together updated to indicate a newly occurring event of the objects, and are changed independently for confirmation of each event by the local monitoring apparatus and the central monitoring apparatus, respectively.

Smith discloses a system for monitoring the performance of remote systems, including centralized server 10 and workstations 40 (see, e.g., FIG. 1 of Smith). Each workstation 40 has a system event log 60 for storing information about workstation events. A message retrieval utility of the centralized server 10 is capable to independently retrieve event log information from the workstations 40. Once retrieved, the event log information is filtered and prioritized for presentation to system administrators.

Unlike the system of Smith, Applicants' claimed invention describes a monitoring apparatus that enables control operations relating to the objects to be performed independently by the central monitoring apparatus and the associated local monitoring apparatus as a result of maintaining two independent information lists in the associated local monitoring apparatus (see, e.g., page 13, line 27 through page 14, line 28 of Applicants' specification). For example, each of the central monitoring apparatus and the associated local monitoring apparatus may independently confirm status changes from respective second and first information sets (see, e.g., page 18, lines 26 – 33 of Applicants' specification and list screens 11A-3, 11B-3 of FIG. 3).

Applicants' invention is thus directed to a system in which a local monitoring apparatus displays monitor information regarding various associated communication apparatus, and a central monitoring apparatus displays monitor information based on information received from one or more monitoring apparatuses. When confirmation of a status change is made at either one of the central monitoring apparatus and the local monitoring apparatus, only the monitor information displayed by the associated apparatus should be updated. In order to accomplish this, two sets of monitor information are

provided in the local monitoring apparatus. The first set of monitor information corresponds to operations directed to the local monitoring apparatus, and the second set corresponds to operations directed to the central monitoring apparatus. Each set is updated to indicate a newly occurring event for the associated communication apparatus, and are changed independently by each of the local monitoring apparatus and the central monitoring apparatus to confirm the event.

Nowhere does Smith disclose or otherwise suggest providing two sets of monitoring information in the local monitoring apparatus for this claimed purpose. Specifically, while Smith does disclose a centralized server capable of retrieving event logs from an individual workstation, Smith fails to disclose or suggest that the centralized server is in addition able to independently change a second set of monitor information maintained in the individual workstation together with a first set of monitor information changed by the individual workstation, in order that monitored events leading to changes in the monitor information can be confirmed.

As a result, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 8 and 11 are not anticipated by Smith, and are therefore allowable. As claims 2 – 7, 8 – 10, and 12 – 13 respectively depend from allowable claims 1, 8 and 11, Applicants submit that claims 2 – 7, 8 – 10, and 12 – 13 are allowable for at least this reason.

CONCLUSION

An earnest effort has been made to be fully responsive to the Examiner's objections. In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is believed that claims 1 – 13, including independent claims 1, 8 and 11 and the claims that depend therefrom, stand

in condition for allowance. Passage of this case to allowance is earnestly solicited. However, if for any reason the Examiner should consider this application not to be in condition for allowance, he is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the number listed below prior to issuing a further Action.

Any fee due with this paper may be charged on Deposit Account 50-1290.

Respectfully submitted,



Thomas J. Bean
Reg. No. 44,528

CUSTOMER NUMBER 026304

KATTEN MUCHIN ZAVIS ROSENMAN
575 MADISON AVENUE
NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10022-2585
PHONE: (212) 940-8800/FAX: (212) 940-8776
DOCKET No.: FUJI 17.354 (100794-11422)